

PATENT
112171-004.A
(Formerly TARINFO.016A)

REMARKS

Claims 51-140 are pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and further examination in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. By the foregoing amendments claims 57, 69, 75, 105, 117, and 129 have been amended and claim 82 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejections under §102(b)

In the office action all of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tornetta (U.S. Patent No. 4,870,576). Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the references of record.

Tornetta describes a system for identifying real estate properties for potential purchase. A host computer system 200 maintains a database of property listings. (Column 7, lines 19-22.) In operation, a user interacts with the remote system 200 to generate a search specification. (see, e.g., Column 9, lines 1-6.) After the search specification has been created and validated by the remote system, it is transmitted via a telecommunication link to the host system. (Column 9, lines 59-63.) The host system generates a search specification based upon the received search specification and that specification is queued for later processing during an off-line period in the host. (Column 8, lines 10-13.) After the search has been processed, the results are mailed to the potential buyer. (Column 8, lines 39-40.)

Independent Claims 57, 69, 75, 105, 117, and 129 have been amended to clarify that the criteria for building the contact list are generated during communication between a user device and a server via a network. That is unlike the system described by Tornetta. Tornetta generates a search specification at the user's remote device without interaction with the host. The remote device runs some type of validation process and then transmits the search criteria to the host. The host then again validates the search criteria and places search criteria in a queue for later batch processing. That creates the real possibility that a user of the system of Tornetta could generate search criteria that are validated at his machine and then sent to the host where they could be rejected in view of data available at the host system which is not available at the remote

PATENT
112171-004.A
(Formerly TARINFO.016A)

system. Embodiments of Applicant's claimed invention overcome that problem by providing a real-time interactive system.

Additionally, Applicant's claimed systems and method also build or generate the contact list for use on the server in real-time. That allows a user the opportunity to reject the list, change the criteria and generate a new list. For example, in a situation where the criteria makes the amount of contacts on the list too small to be useful, the user can broaden their criteria in order to have a more inclusive list. The real-time generation of the contact list makes that possible. The batch processing of Tornetta would prohibit such interaction and iterative list generation.

Finally, Independent Claims 57, 59, 105, 117, and 129 include transmitting the contact list to a user-specified node on the network. Tornetta does not teach or disclose a system including such transmitting. In the Office Action column 9, lines 48-65 of Tornetta were identified as corresponding to that element. However that section of Tornetta is merely describing the process which occurs on the remote system when generating the search criteria. It does not refer to and does not include transmitting a contact list to a user-specified node. Rather, it refers to transmitting search criteria to the host system. The resulting list of properties in Tornetta is transmitted to the potential buyer via U.S. mail.

In view of the foregoing Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under Section 102(b) have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims, the reasons therefor, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are made in order to improve the clarity of claim language, to correct grammatical mistakes or ambiguities, and to otherwise improve the capacity of the claims to particularly and distinctly point out the invention to those of skill in the art. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner finds any

PATENT
112171-004.A
(Formerly TARINFO.016A)

remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 2, 2006


Richard E. Campbell
Reg. No. 34,790

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP
530 B Street, Suite 2100
San Diego, California 92101-4469
(619) 238-1900 (Phone)
(619) 235-0398 (Fax)
Customer No. 27189